# California Energy Commission STAFF REPORT

# LOCALIZED HEALTH IMPACTS REPORT

Addendum 5 for a Selected Project With a Location Change Awarded Funding Through the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program Under Solicitation PON-11-602 - Alternative Fuels Infrastructure: Electric, Natural Gas, Propane, E85, and Diesel Substitutes Terminals



CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

CEC-600-2014-008-AD5

AUGUST 29, 2014

# CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Patrick Brecht **Primary Author** 

Sarah Williams **Project Manager** 

John P. Butler II

Office Manager

EMERGING FUELS AND TECHNOLOGIES

OFFICE

Randy Roesser

Deputy Director

FUELS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

Robert P. Oglesby **Executive Director** 

#### **DISCLAIMER**

Staff members of the California Energy Commission prepared this report. As such, it does not necessarily represent the views of the Energy Commission, its employees, or the State of California. The Energy Commission, the State of California, its employees, contractors and subcontractors make no warrant, express or implied, and assumes no legal liability for the information in this report; nor does any party represent that the use of this information will not infringe upon privately owned rights. This report has not been approved or disapproved by the Energy Commission nor has the Commission passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information in this report.

### **ADDENDUM 5**

The Localized Health Impacts Report Addendum for Selected Projects Awarded Funding Through the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program Under Solicitation PON-11-602 – Alternative Fuels Infrastructure: Electric, Natural Gas, Propane, E85, and Diesel Substitutes Terminals was originally posted September 21, 2012.<sup>1</sup>

The assessment approach of this addendum is as written in CEC-600-2012-004-AD. This addendum to the localized health impacts report assesses and reports on the potential localized health impacts of a station location change for RTC Fuels, LLC dba Pearson Fuels, project "19 Pearson Fuels E85 Stations." The original E85 station location was 376 Castro Street, San Francisco, CA 94114. This station location will be replaced by the new location of 2831 Cesar Chavez Street, San Francisco, CA 94110. The Cesar Chavez Street location has the same nonattainment status for ozone, particulate matter (PM) 2.5, and PM 10 as the Castro Street location. See Table 1.2

**Table 1: Community Status and Project Overview** 

Project	At-Risk Community	CEQA Completed	Air District Permit Status	Attainment Status for Ozone, PM (2.5), PM (10)	
Cesar Chavez	No	Complete	In Process	Nonattainment (PM [10])	
Street					

Source: Energy Commission staff analysis

The Cesar Chavez location will have the surroundings shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Surroundings for the New Site Location** 

New Address	Surroundings (within a 1-mile radius)
2831 Cesar Chavez	22 schools, 21 day-care facilities, and 8 health-care offices
Street, San	
Francisco, CA	
94110	

Source: Energy Commission staff analysis

The following overview includes a project description that includes impacts, benefits, outreach efforts, and a discussion of the potential health impacts related to air pollutants explicitly

<sup>1</sup> Williams, Sarah, Eric Law. 2012. *Localized Health Impacts Report*. California Energy Commission, Fuels and Transportation Division. Publication Number: CEC-600-2012-004-AD

<sup>2 &</sup>quot;Particulate matter" is unburned fuel particles that form smoke or soot and stick to lung tissue when inhaled, and a chief component of exhaust emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines.

identified in the project. In addition, demographic data for the planned project location is provided in Table 3.

# RTC Fuels, LLC dba Pearson Fuels Project Name: 19 Pearson Fuels E85 Stations

Cesar Chavez Street, San Francisco, California, 94110

The new proposed station will be located at an existing retail gasoline and diesel fueling station located off of Highway 101. This proposed station is located in both a residential and business area.

#### PROJECT-GENERATED EMISSIONS

The project has been evaluated using Appendix A of the August 2007 *Full Fuel Cycle Assessment: Well-to-Wheels Energy Inputs, Emissions, and Water Impacts,* CEC-600-2007-004-REV and the December 2007 *State Alternative Fuels Plan,* CEC-600-2007-011-CMF. It is verified in the Full Fuel Cycle Assessment (FFCA) that even corn-based E85 shows at least a 70 percent reduction in petroleum use and a reduction in carbon intensity (CI) ranging between 15 percent and 36 percent as compared to the CI of California reformulated gasoline (RFG). Sugarcane and biomass based E85 shows at least a 72 percent reduction in petroleum use and a reduction in CI ranging between 60 percent and 72 percent as compared to the CI of California RFG.

#### PROJECT HEALTH IMPACTS

The majority of the E85 that will be dispensed from this station will be displacing California RFG gasoline that would be otherwise transported and burned within the same localized air shed. Therefore, the addition of the E85 to the station will decrease the area criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminates in an amount directly related to the difference between the fuel cycle emissions of those fuels.

#### PROJECT SUMMARY

Pearson will replace the fuel in one of the existing underground storage tanks so that the station can sell high blends of ethanol (E85) in addition to the fuel it currently sells. In order to do this, it is necessary to replace some of the components attached to the top of the tank as well as replace two of the existing fuel dispensers that are compatible with E85.

Specifically, Pearson will be replacing the drop tube system and adding Phase 1 Vapor Recovery to what is now the diesel tank. The existing drop tube and turbine assembly will be removed and replaced with new certified components compatible with E85. Pearson will also replace two of the existing fuel dispensers with two certified E85 dispensers.

Pearson will use a 90.1 CI ethanol-to-blend E85. E85 in California is nominally 83 percent ethanol and 17 percent California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB) with CI scores of 90.1 (in Pearson's case) and 95.86, respectively. In performing the calculation, you can see that the project's E85 has an implied CI score of  $((.83 \times 90.1) + (.17 \times 10^{-5}))$ 

95.86)) = 91.08, a very substantial improvement over CARBOB.

#### **OUTREACH EFFORTS**

Once the station opens, Pearson will hold a grand opening event where they will sell fuel at \$1.85 per gallon or give it away for free for a few hours in order to garner press coverage and local community support. Once the word is out, Pearson will continue to leverage the national marketing of E85 stations that has been going on for years through several national organizations. There are currently at least twelve different online California E85 station locator tools operated by many different organizations. The purpose of these tools is to communicate to the public the availability of E85 in their area. Pearson will work closely with all of the locator tool providers to keep them up to date, and can readily share this station information for the Energy Commission's DRIVE web site.

Pearson will have informational brochures located on brochure holders at the dispensers. Pearson will also have web links on the front page of its website as new stations come on line. New stations will be added with direction services being available as they are now for Pearson's other stations. As the infrastructure develops, Pearson may offer its station partners the opportunity for a co-op program where one cent per gallon will go into an advertising, outreach and education program to promote the fuel at all of its stations statewide, providing significant economies of scale.

## **Location Analysis and Community Impacts**

Based on the information provided, the community is not disproportionately affected by this project. None of the Environmental Justice (EJ) indicators are present in this city, and the above information indicates that there will be no net increase in criteria and toxic air pollutants as a result of the installation of the equipment and increased throughput at each facility.

Location analysis and community impacts are based on comparing the project location demographics to that of California. San Francisco has no EJ indicators (that is, no indication of a minority population, poverty level, unemployment rate, or age).

The last table in this addendum provides city-level data for the city project location to give additional insight on the community demographics where the project will be located.

Table 3: Demographic Data including EJ Indicators (percentage) (Compared to the State of California)

	Persons	Black	American	Persons of	White	Persons	Persons	Un-
	Below	persons	Indian	Hispanic	persons	under 5	over 65	employm-
	Poverty	(2010)	and	or Latino	(2010)	years of	years of	ent rate
	Level		Alaska	Origin		age (2010)	age	(June
	(2008-		Native	(2010)			(2010)	2014)
	2012)		(2010)					
California	15.3	6.2	1.0	37.6	40.1	6.8	11.4	7.4
San	13.2	6.1	0.5	15.1	41.9	4.4	13.6	4.5
Francisco								

Sources: Unemployment information from the State of California, Employee Development Department (EDD) Labor Market Information Division: <a href="http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/CES/Labor\_Force\_Unemployment\_Data\_for\_Cities\_and\_Census\_Areas.html">http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/CES/Labor\_Force\_Unemployment\_Data\_for\_Cities\_and\_Census\_Areas.html</a>

and Demographics information from the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census

Bureau: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/0667000.html.

## **Summary**

The proposed project location is anticipated to impact the city of San Francisco positively due the majority of the E85 that will be dispensed from the station will be replacing California RFG gasoline that would be otherwise transported and burned within the same localized air shed. Therefore, the addition of the E85 to the station will decrease the area criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminates in an amount directly related to the difference between the fuel cycle emissions of those fuels. The anticipated impact to San Francisco would be positive in terms of cleaner air and anticipated greenhouse gas reductions.